



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 2, 2004

Ms. Rebecca F. Vann
Assistant County Attorney
Henderson County
Henderson County Courthouse, Room 100
Athens, Texas 75751

OR2004-1577

Dear Ms. Vann:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 197007.

The Henderson County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff") received a request for copies of (1) the 911 tape recording all emergency calls to the sheriff's department during a specified time, (2) any other recordings reflecting calls from other law enforcement agencies during the same specified time, (3) the rules, regulations and policy memos regarding light and siren use in response to emergency calls, and (4) any disciplinary, incident, or investigative reports regarding a specific deputy. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.103, 552.111 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You assert that section 552.103 of the Government Code excepts all of the documents in Exhibit 3. Section 552.103 states the following, in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure

under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). To secure the protection of section 552.103(a), the sheriff must demonstrate the requested information "relates" to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation. Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991). The sheriff has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the applicability of an exception in a particular situation. The test for establishing the applicability of section 552.103(a) is a two-prong showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information or investigates the circumstances surrounding a potential claim does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state that "while at the scene and speaking with the individuals who were involved in the accident... [the sergeant] heard 'that the other party is considering legal action.'" This alone is insufficient to meet the first prong of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361. Therefore, based on our review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude the sheriff has not sufficiently established that it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the sheriff received the present request for information. Accordingly, the sheriff may not withhold the documents in Exhibit 3 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You also contend section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts the documents contained in Exhibit 3. This provision excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." Gov't Code § 552.111. In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no

writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency's policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 generally does not except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5.

After reviewing the documents in Exhibit 3, we find the information does not implicate the policymaking functions of the sheriff. Rather, the information relates to a personnel matter involving a single officer. Therefore, the sheriff may not withhold the documents in Exhibit 3 under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Additionally, you indicate that portions of Exhibit 3 are excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.102 claim in the context of the doctrine of common-law privacy under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Common-law privacy, as encompassed by section 552.101, protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: an individual's criminal history when compiled by a governmental body, see Open Records Decision No. 565 (citing *United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989)), personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a

governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). Based on our review of the submitted information, we find that some of the information is protected by common-law privacy and must therefore be withheld pursuant to section 552.101. We have marked this information.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by other statutes. We note that some of the submitted information constitutes medical record information, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code.¹ Section 159.002 provides in pertinent part:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Further, information that is subject to the MPA also includes information that was obtained from medical records. *See* Occ. Code § 159.002(a), (b), (c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Medical records must be released upon the governmental body's receipt of the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). We have marked the medical record information that is subject to the MPA. Absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the sheriff must withhold this information pursuant to the MPA.

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

We note that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure the present and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer regardless of whether the officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code or complies with section 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, we conclude that the department must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2).²

Finally, the submitted documents contain information that is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Accordingly, you must withhold the Texas motor vehicle information we have marked.

In summary, the sheriff must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 3 pursuant to sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130. Additionally, the sheriff must withhold the marked medical records in their entirety pursuant to the Medical Practice Act. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

² Because we base our ruling regarding this particular type of information on 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code, we need not address the applicability of your section 552.1175 claim.

Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. Id. § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. Id. § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. Id. § 552.321(a); Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/seg

Ref: ID# 197007

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Susan B. Heygood
Hall & Heygood
2605 Airport Freeway, Suite 100
Fort Worth, Texas 76111
(w/o enclosures)